

REMARKS

Initially, it is noted that the response to arguments clearly indicates that the rejection, based on Ozawa, has been "removed." Thus, it is believed that the material included in paragraph 3 of the office action is inadvertent. To the extent that the rejection, based on Ozawa, is maintained, the Applicant hereby incorporates herein its responses to Ozawa in the previous response.

Claim 32 calls for a control to receive states and to change the impedance of a selectively variable impedance to signal the state. The cited reference to Nakabayashi does not use the impedance of a selectively variable impedance to signal a state. Instead, it uses switch position as shown clearly in the chart at column 7, lines 40-45.

In response to a given control signal, the switches 9 through 12 are placed in various states which result in the appropriate motor operation. Thus, it is not an impedance that is used to signal state, but a switch position by a circuit 7 supplies energizing or drive signals to those switches 9 to 12 which have been selected by the controller 5. For example, at the top of column 8, it is explained that when FETs 9 and 12 are energized by the control signal decoded by control logic 6, current flows from the voltage supply plus V<sub>CC</sub> to FET 9, through the motor 2, and through the FET 12 to the current detector 4. The other operations are also explained. Thus, the switches 9 through 12 are simply operated to allow or disallow current flow. There is no impedance signaling or use of impedance levels to signal a state.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Date: March 24, 2006

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation